


125 SUMMER STREET BOSTON MA 02110-1618

T 617 443 9292 F 617 443 0004 WWW.BROMSUN.COM

BROMBERG &amp; SUNSTEIN LLP

## FACSIMILE

TO Examiner To FAX (703) 746-7419  
FROM Jeffrey T. Klayman  PAGES 12 (INCLUDING THIS SHEET)  
PHONE DATE 8/20/2003  
RE System, Device, and Method For Providing Mutual Exclusion for Computer  
System Resources  
Serial No.: 09/480,390  
OUR FILE 1956/126 YOUR FILE

---

## COMMENTS

Please see attached.

PLEASE NOTIFY BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP AT (617) 443-9292, IF THERE ARE ANY PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSMISSION.

THIS TRANSMITTAL IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE ADDRESSEE, AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED OR CONFIDENTIAL. IF THE RECIPIENT OF THIS TRANSMITTAL IS NOT THE ADDRESSEE, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE.

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Michael P. Wagner                      Att'y Docket: 1956/126  
Serial No.: 09/480,390                              Art Unit: 2172  
Filed: January 11, 2000                              Examiner: To, B.  
Title: SYSTEM; DEVICE, AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING MUTUAL  
EXCLUSION FOR COMPUTER SYSTEM RESOURCES

## CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this document, along with any other papers referred to as being attached or enclosed, is being transmitted by facsimile to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, to the attention of Examiner To of Art Unit 2172 at the non-official facsimile number (703) 748-7419 on August 20, 2003

Jeffrey T. Klayman

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**REVISED INTERVIEW SUMMARY AND PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

Dear Sir:

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy extended of a telephonic conversation held on August 14, 2003 between Mr. Jeffrey Klayman, Examiner To, and Primary Examiner Corrielus during which was discussed Applicant's response of June 13, 2003 and the Bacon reference addressed therein. Mr. Klayman explained how the present invention as claimed differs from Bacon and the other prior art of record. The Examiners expressed an opinion that ghost locks are similar to temporary locks as known in the art, and suggested that the claims be amended to further distinguish over temporary locks, for example, by specifying how ghost locks are used. Therefore, Applicant hereby submits the following proposed amendment:

Amendments to the Claims begin on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 11 of this paper.